





seen, every pleasant day, mounted on one of the finest horses from the eloquent Virginian's stud, taking that exercise so essential to sustain him in the discharge of the fatiguing duties of his station, which was presented to him by the descendant of Pocahontas.

From the Maine Democrat.  
EXTRACT OF A LETTER  
From a gentleman in Washington to his friend in this town, dated December 27.

Little is doing, or will be done in either House, until the holy days are passed, when from present indications, business will flow on speedily and uninterruptedly, and the wants of the nation be carefully and diligently sought after and provided for. Mr. Wright's bill in relation to the banks in this district will compel them to redeem their notes in specie, or stop entirely. I hear much about the resumption of specie payments by the banks, but one appears to be waiting for the other, and thus they manage, by the assistance and support of each other, to keep the people out of their just dues for as long a time as they choose. But the evil day (fatal to so many of them I fear) which they are striving to put far from them, must come at last, and the account they will have to settle with an indignant and injured community, will be an awful account—but the worst of it is they have got to render this account; and at the same time they know that the judgment has already passed, and they have received their condemnation. Business is already reverting to its proper channels, and begins to revive, and as matter of course, the funds begin to droop and hang their heads. The storm they have raised has spent its force, and although the consequences have in some instances been disastrous, and everywhere injurious, yet the sun is again peeping through the clouds by which he has so long been hid, and is enlivening the earth with his cheering beams. American enterprise and diligence will overcome this as it has every other obstacle thrown across her path by time-serving and designing politicians, to retard her upward and onward progress, and the bright refulgence of her beams will dazzle the weak vision, and overwhelm with shame and disgrace, all who have been laboring to accomplish her downfall.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

A bill passed the Senate, after a long discussion prohibiting the circulation of small bills in the District. It is one of the vilest and most contemptible of all the measures of Benton—Van Buren, Loco-focoism. All notes of a denomination under five dollars, are forbidden circulation under the severest and most odious penalties. The offence of passing any bill under five dollars is made indictable—and punishable by a fine of fifty dollars; and the Government holds out its encouragement to informers and spies, by putting into the pocket of any levelling scoundrel who shall, by his testimony, bring the offender to judgment—one half the amount of the fine.

The correspondent of the N. Y. Express, writing on the subject, says:—

"Mr. Clay, to-day, in a manner much more excited than he is wont to be upon any political question, gave his opinion very freely of the measure and men of the Administration. He told the committee of Finance, in just so many words, with his eye upon Mr. Wright, the chairman, that 'they ought to be ashamed of themselves for introducing such a bill,'—that it was a wretched and miserable piece of legislation, and got up to oppress the slaves—the free negroes, the beggars, the poor women and children of the District of Columbia. Mr. Preston responded in similar terms, and nearly all the Senators spoke either upon the one side or the other. The bill was finally passed, after a session of more than four hours."

The above beautiful and polished effusion is from the Bangor Whig. The way Mr. Clay flattered it when he came to vote on this same "vilest and most contemptible" measure—this bill which the Committee ought to be "ashamed of themselves for introducing" is a "caution" to those who think, or wish to make others think, that the opposition of Clay and Preston to this policy of the administration is any thing but factious.

On the engrossment of the bill in the Senate, the vote stood—yeas 30, nays 01 Messrs. Clay, Preston and others who had assailed it, dodged the question. If they believed it to be, as they described it, a "BILL OF ABOMINATIONS," were they not recreant to their oaths and the trust reposed in them, in failing to record their votes against it?

But on the passage of the bill the nature of their opposition was unmasked. They perceived that they could not again avoid recording their votes. They were brought to the dilemma either of putting on record their sanction of the shin-plaster and small bill currency, or of voting all their objections and protestations of the day before to have been attempts to beat down a policy against which they were "ashamed" to record their votes. They took the latter horn of the dilemma (a), and "eructed" their eloquent speeches, in preference to impaling themselves on the Journal of the Senate. Yes, Messrs. Clay and Preston voted in

(a) The vote on the final passage of the bill was as follows:—

Yeas—Messrs. Allen, Benton, Brown Buchanan, Clay of Alabama, Clay of Kentucky, Cuthbert, Fulton, Grundy, Hubbard, King of Alabama, Knight, Linn, Lyon, Lumpkin, McKean, Morris, Nicholas, Niles, Norvell, Pierce, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Robinson, Sevier, Smith of Connecticut, Smith of Indiana, Spencer, Strange, Tipton, Walker, Wall, White, Williams, Wright and Young—37.

Nay—Mr. Twiss.

favor of this very bill which they said "the committee ought to be ashamed of themselves for reporting."

The Globe of the 26th describes the scene as follows: "The bill was put upon its passage to-day; and those who had spoken so furiously against it day after day; who had denounced it as a measure of which the authors ought to be 'ashamed;' who had execrated it as a bill of pains and penalties against 'minors, little boys and girls, children, the very beggars whom we meet in the Avenue,' who denounced the cruelty which would make these 'unfortunate' the subject of such punishment; who invoked the Senate not 'to attack negroes and little children,' but 'to strike rather at higher game,' those who run off from this bill of abominations on its third reading on Saturday, after all the amendments were made, came in to-day and recorded their names for this shocking outrage upon all humanity. A general expression of derision pervaded the Senate when the thundering orators—Messrs. CLAY and PRESTON—were drawn up to-day, and were compelled either to vote that all they had said before was sheer hypocrisy and cant, or to make it clear by the journal that they were in favor of the shin-plaster system, and were working it for political effect; or again to run, as they did on Friday, from the eyes and noses. The poor men had brought themselves into a most distressing dilemma. Their motions to postpone—their passionate and moving appeals—all their arguments addressed to 'party feeling'—had failed to bring up their troops to vote a license to that petit larceny through which they hope the country may be harassed into a willingness to be broken on that great balance wheel—a national bank. Finding that their followers would fly on the third reading, they made haste to escape them, and in such hurry, that they most have been dexterous in avoiding desks, chairs and benches, so as not to render actual shin-plasters necessary, to heal the wounds of those who had fought the battle so stoutly for their metaphorical brethren.

But what must have been the sensations of those high-minded Senators when the alarming bill was again brought up for final action, and they, upon sober consideration, had discovered that they dare not again run away from the vote. Mr. CLAY has too much reputation, and too many eyes upon him, to venture upon so sudden a change without a pretext. He, therefore, with uncommon boldness—not to say audacity—put his resolution to a new stand in the Senate—a stand by the bill—asserted that the amendment about the mode of proof for the offence to be remedied had removed his objections to it, when the whole scope of his argument had been directed against the main provisions which now constitute the bill, and when the amendment which he now pretends reconciled him had been made, before he ran off from it. Mr. PRESTON, on his part, solemnly declared that his absconding was a mere matter of accident.

We have some little Clays and Prestons in this State who have made it their business to ridicule the policy of 'suppressing small bills, and who will doubtless attempt to overthrow it in this State. The trouble is that they are 'little' ones. If they had sagacity to foresee the consequences of their political acts, and reputation to lose thereby, they would do what Clay and Preston have done in the Senate—talk in favor of small bills and shin-plasters, but be very careful to record their votes against them—at any rate to put nothing on record in their favor. Augusta Age.

Reported for the Journal of Commerce.

IN SENATE, Saturday, Jan. 6.

Mr. McKean introduced the following resolutions, which were laid on the table, to come up in order.

Resolved, That Congress possesses no power under the constitution to abolish slavery where it exists in any of the States of this Union.

Resolved, That it is inexpedient to legislate at this time on the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia.

The consideration of Mr. Calhoun's resolutions was then resumed, and on the adoption of an amendment by Mr. Morris that gentleman has continued speaking till this hour, (2 o'clock P. M.)

P. S. The amendment proposed by Mr. Morris was rejected by a vote of thirty-two to nine. The amendment of Mr. Allen, adopted yesterday, was withdrawn, to be offered again at the close of the whole series. An amendment proposed by Mr. Bayard, was rejected by a vote of thirty-four to eight. The question then recurred on Mr. Calhoun's third resolution, which was adopted by a vote of 31 to 11.

The House of Representatives did not sit on Saturday.

#### CONGRESS.

In Senate, Friday, Dec. 29.—Mr. Webster appeared to-day and took his seat.

Counter Manifesto to the Resolutions of Mr. Calhoun.—Mr. Morris of Ohio, presented a series of resolutions embracing his views of the rights and obligations of the General Government and of the States, especially in reference to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

The resolutions are very long, and express opinions and sentiments directly the opposite of those contained in the resolutions offered by Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Morris moved that the resolutions be printed.

Mr. Calhoun said he was quite willing that they should be printed. He regarded them as presenting the antagonist side of the question to that set forth by him. They are, he said,

decidedly abolition doctrines.

The creed of that set is now distinctly avowed in the Senate; and he trusted that a vote would be taken upon it.

In the House.—Petitions and memorials were presented from the different States—a large proportion of them being for the abolition of slavery, or remonstrating against the annexation of Texas or any slave holding state to the union.

The former were laid on the table, under the rule adopted in Mr. Patton's resolution; and the latter took the same course by successive motions.

When Mr. Adams was called upon, he presented a memorial for the abolition of slavery in the declaration he had made respecting the Resolution of Mr. Patton at the time it was adopted, he held himself no otherwise bound by it than by physical force. He held all the freedom of speech that he did had the resolution never passed.

Mr. Lawler, of Ala., called Mr. Adams to order.

Mr. Adams said he made these remarks as preparatory to giving notice, that he intended an early day to offer a motion for rescinding that infamous resolution!

Left sitting.

#### ONFORD DEMOCRAT.

Paris, January 16, 1838.

We have received and lay before our readers the Report of the Committee of the Legislature on the votes for Governor. The report gives to Mr. Kent one hundred and ninety-three votes more than were received by all others. It appears that some votes were rejected for informalities, but counting all the votes given and returned, Mr. Kent would have a majority. Without any reference therefore to the result, we must be permitted to dissent from some of the principles laid down in the Report. We acknowledge that there are difficulties in the way of a liberal or strict construction of the provisions of the Constitution. We have been and still are in favor of counting votes where the provisions of the Constitution have been substantially complied with, but all admit that there must be some bounds to this liberality. The precedent of to-day becomes the law of to-morrow, and we may thus go on until all the barriers which the Constitution has raised around the exercise of this privilege to protect it from abuse and guard it from corruption, shall have been removed, and in our desire to protect the rights of the people we may expose them to the designs of the unprincipled. A reference to the report will show the dangers to which we may be exposed under professions of liberality. If the principles there laid down are to be sanctioned—if the proprieties (to call them by no harsher name) found to exist in some of the cases there enumerated, are to be overlooked though fraud may not be legalized in the present instance, yet a door will be opened, and an opportunity offered, for practices which the Constitution has cautiously guarded against. It may be a question worthy of attentive consideration, whether it would not be better that the votes even of a whole town should be rejected, than that practices should be sanctioned which may lead to fraud and corruption. We feel anxious to encourage the use of the objection, that the people ought not to be deprived of their right of suffrage, because their officers have been remiss or unfaithful—that the guilty alone should be punished. But so long as the votes are counted, the people will not trouble themselves to call their officers to account. Reject them, and then public indignation may be raised to punish the offenders.

Any of our readers who have looked into a Federal paper for some time past will have noticed that much is said there about loco focism, which is signified as being all that is contemptible and degrading in politics. If you examine these papers to find what this bugbear is, you will be told that it consists principally in being anti-Bank—that is in being favorable to a more extensive specie basis than we have at present, and that its most destructive feature is an opposition to the circulation of small bills. They will therefore be not a little surprised to learn that Mr. Clay one of the federal candidates for the Presidency, has by his vote avowed himself a loco foco according to the federal interpretation of the term. The facts are these. Mr. Benton recently introduced into the Senate of the United States a Bill for the suppression of Bank notes of a smaller denomination than five dollars in the District of Columbia, similar to the law passed in this State two years since, which the federal papers have made so much noise about. This was of course attacked and denounced by all the Bank presses as a miserable and contemptible affair, "one of Benton's humbugs," "the essence of loco focism." But when the question was taken on the final passage of that bill, by yeas and nays, Henry Clay voted for it, and so did his friends and followers. Only one voted against it. If such a law is wise and salutary, why should it be repealed here. We hope and trust that the example of Mr. Clay will not be lost upon his friends and admirers in this State, and that they will not by attempting a repeal of our law upon that subject cast an indirect censure upon the vote of Mr. Clay.

The Report of the Committee on the votes for Governor passed the House on Thursday last by a strictly party vote so far as we can judge of 96 to 81. The democratic members contended for its recommitment with instructions to the Committee to report to the House the facts, in those cases where remonstrances had been made. But the federalists said that they were satisfied Mr. Kent was elected and therefore it would be wasting time to examine into the facts. Had the report stated that Mr. Kent was elected by a majority of the votes returned, it might have been accepted, but when members were called upon to sanction the doctrines and conclusions of that report by voting for its acceptance, it is no wonder that they hesitated, and it is to be doubted whether the Senate will ever accept it without some modifications.

The Joint Select Committee, to whom was referred the votes for Governor, given in the several cities, towns and plantations in this State, having had the same under consideration, ask leave to

#### REPORT.

That the whole number of votes for Governor, which have been legally and constitutionally returned from the several cities, towns and plantations in the State, is sixty-eight thousand five hundred and twenty-three; that the number necessary to constitute an election, is thirty-

four thousand two hundred and sixty two; that Edward Kent has thirty-four thousand three hundred and fifty-eight; that Gorham Parks has thirty-three thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine; other persons have two hundred and eighty-six; and that Edward Kent having received one hundred and ninety three votes more than all other persons voted for, is constitutionally elected Governor of the State of Maine.

The return of votes from the town of Bristol, was not certified on the inside by the town Clerk. These votes were not allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, two hundred and twenty-five; and for Gorham Parks, two hundred and twenty-eight. The returns from Dedham, Wesley, Weston, Kingsbury, Argyle Plantation, and Plantation No. 1, North Division, Hancock County, were not certified by either of the Selectmen, or town or plantation Clerks on the outside. The votes from said towns and plantations were allowed and counted, viz: for Edward Kent, one hundred and eleven, and for Gorham Parks, two hundred and three. The returns from Hiram, Lincoln, Roxbury, Snowville, and Mattawamkeag, north of Lincoln, contained no certificate of having been sealed up in open town or plantation meeting, and it was not certified in the return from No. 23, that they were declared in open meeting. These votes were allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, one hundred and seventy-two; and for Gorham Parks, two hundred and sixty-six.

The return from Backfield states that "five votes were given for Gorham Parks after the votes were declared and counted." These votes were allowed and counted for Gorham Parks. The return of votes from Amity was attested by the town Clerk, and two other persons, inside, without designating their official character; they were not signed or certified on the outside by any one. These votes were allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, two; for Gorham Parks, twenty. The return from Cornish was made upon a plantation blank return; and was signed by two persons designated as "Assessors." These votes were allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, fifty-two; and for Gorham Parks, one hundred and twenty-six.

The returns from Moscow and Howland, were signed by the town Clerk and one Selectman only, on the inside; but on the outside by two Selectmen and the town Clerk. These votes were allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, eighty-two; and for Gorham Parks, fifty-nine. The return from Calais, states that "it appears in evidence that one person voted twice." The votes of said town were allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, two hundred and nine; and for Gorham Parks, two hundred and fifty-three. The return from Grandville was not dated on the outside. These votes were allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, fourteen; and for Gorham Parks, twenty-seven. The return from Plymouth states that one vote for Gorham Parks was received while counting; this vote was allowed and counted for Mr. Parks. The return from Howland states that "a person calling himself an inhabitant of No. 3, Eighth Range, was allowed to vote in Howland; which vote was given for Gorham Parks; this vote was allowed and counted for Mr. Parks. The return from Hallowell, on the inside, states that the meeting was held on the second Monday of September, being the 11th day of said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and —. The blank for the date of the year was omitted to be filled up, it was perfect in all other respects. On the outside is the usual certificate, signed by the Selectmen and attested by the town Clerk, that it contained a list of the votes given in by the inhabitants of the town of Hallowell, for Governor on the second Monday of September, 1837, and was sealed up in open town meeting. On the outside was also a memorandum, in writing, that said return was received at the office of the Secretary of State, September 12, 1837. These votes were allowed and counted; for Edward Kent, six hundred and eighteen; for Gorham Parks, one hundred and fifty-one. The return from Milford, on the outside, contains a memorandum, in writing, signed by the Secretary of State, that it "was not sealed when received at this office," but it contained the usual certificate on the outside, of the Selectmen and town Clerk, that it was sealed up in open town meeting. It does not appear to have any post mark upon it; nor is there any appearance of mutilation, or erasures in the return. These votes were rejected, they were for Edward Kent, seventy-five; for Gorham Parks, forty-one. The return from Paris states that "one vote was given for scattering;" this vote was rejected. The return from Lincolnville states that one vote was given for — Kent; this vote was rejected. The return from Greenfield was not certified, or signed, by any one on the inside; on the outside it was in proper form; these votes were for Edward Kent, sixteen; for Gorham Parks, eighteen; and were rejected. There was no return from the town of Albany.

Remonstrances were referred to the Committee against the reception of the votes of the towns of Leeds, Fayette, and Fairfield. It is alleged in the remonstrance from the town of Leeds, that the votes were not sealed up in open town meeting; but there is on the return the certificate prescribed by law, that the votes were sealed up in open town meeting, signed by the Selectmen and town Clerk. The Committee decided in relation to towns where the returns furnished no evidence of having been sealed up in open town meeting, that the votes should be accepted and counted; they refused in this case, to admit parol evidence, to contradict the legal certificate made by the Selectmen and town Clerk, which they had adjudged to be unnecessary, in so large a class of cases, and accepted the votes.

It was alleged in the remonstrance from the town of Fayette, that during an adjournment of the meeting for Governor, the box containing the ballots was placed in the window of the meeting house, and that the chairman observed to the selectmen who had charge of the same, not to suffer them to be handled or disturbed, but that an individual other than the selectmen and not acting under the solemnities of an oath, did take the ballot box and receive a number of votes—the committee understood this as a distinct charge of fraud in relation to the votes so alleged to have been given, and on that ground and that only, went into a full examination of all the evidence offered. It appeared in evidence that during the suspension or adjournment of the meeting for the purpose of transacting town business, the ballot box containing the votes for Governor was placed on the sill of the window of the pulpit; and was exposed to the view of the meeting generally; that during a short period, when neither of the selectmen were in the pulpit, nor any other person than the town Clerk and Samuel Hearsay, who had gone into the pulpit to write, that an individual came to the pulpit with three young men, all legal voters in said town, and whose names were on the check list, and asked Hearsay to hand down the box and let them vote. That he took the box from the window, stepped to the side of the pulpit, and received from each of the three persons a single vote for Governor, and then replaced the box on the window sill, that these votes were for Edward Kent, and that they were the only votes thrown by these men on that day, and that they were received without the knowledge of the selectmen; and that no other person than the selectmen and town Clerk and Mr. Hearsay were in the pulpit during the suspension or adjournment of the meeting, and that the window stool of the pulpit was some 6 or 10 steps above the floor of the house; the committee believing that these facts did not require the disfranchisement of the electors of Fayette, accepted and counted the votes of that town, excepting the three as aforesaid.

It is further alleged in said remonstrance that a meeting was held under a moderator for the transaction of town business immediately after receiving the votes for Governor, which was first adjourned one hour, and finally adjourned to the second Saturday in October, and that after final adjournment the selectmen proceeded to sort, count and declare the votes for Governor—the committee do not perceive that these facts if true should have any influence on the legality of the meeting for receiving the votes for Governor, and as the selectmen and town clerk had certified in their return, which is in the form prescribed by the constitution and the laws, inside and out; that the votes were sorted, counted, declared and sealed up, in open town meeting, the committee declined to admit any testimony on this part of the remonstrance, and accepted and counted the votes of Fairfield.

The constitution of the State having provided that the votes for Governor shall be received, sorted, counted, declared, recorded and sealed up in open town meeting, and returned into the Secretary's office, and laid by him before the Senate and House of Representatives, and the form of return having been established by law—the committee believed, that it might not be competent to them or the Legislature to go into any testimony to invalidate or contradict the returns or disfranchise the electors of towns whose returns were made according to the constitution and the laws, excepting in cases where fraud was suggested or illegal. Your committee were disposed distinctly to recognize this rule in relation to the returns from the towns of Leeds, Fairfield and Fayette—the evils resulting from a different course would in the opinion of your committee tend to protracting indefinitely the organization of the Government,

be unnecessary, in so large a class of cases, and accepted the votes.

It was alleged in the remonstrance from the town of Fayette, that during an adjournment of the meeting for Governor, the box containing the ballots was placed in the window of the meeting house, and that the chairman observed to the selectmen who had charge of the same, not to suffer them to be handled or disturbed, but that an individual other than the selectmen and not acting under the solemnities of an oath, did take the ballot box and receive a number of votes—the committee understood this as a distinct charge of fraud in relation to the votes so alleged to have been given, and on that ground and that only, went into a full examination of all the evidence offered. It appeared in evidence that during the suspension or adjournment of the meeting for the purpose of transacting town business, the ballot box containing the votes for Governor was placed on the sill of the window of the pulpit; and was exposed to the view of the meeting generally; that during a short period, when neither of the selectmen were in the pulpit, nor any other person than the town Clerk and Samuel Hearsay, who had gone into the pulpit to write, that an individual came to the pulpit with three young men, all legal voters in said town, and whose names were on the check list, and asked Hearsay to hand down the box and let them vote. That he took the box from the window, stepped to the side of the pulpit, and received from each of the three persons a single vote for Governor, and then replaced the box on the window sill, that these votes were for Edward Kent, and that they were the only votes thrown by these men on that day, and that they were received without the knowledge of the selectmen; and that no other person than the selectmen and town Clerk and Mr. Hearsay were in the pulpit during the suspension or adjournment of the meeting, and that the window stool of the pulpit was some 6 or 10 steps above the floor of the house; the committee believing that these facts did not require the disfranchisement of the electors of Fayette, accepted and counted the votes of that town, excepting the three as aforesaid.

It is further alleged in said remonstrance that a meeting was held under a moderator for the transaction of town business immediately after receiving the votes for Governor, which was first adjourned one hour, and finally adjourned to the second Saturday in October, and that after final adjournment the selectmen proceeded to sort, count and declare the votes for Governor—the committee do not perceive that these facts if true should have any influence on the legality of the meeting for receiving the votes for Governor, and as the selectmen and town clerk had certified in their return, which is in the form prescribed by the constitution and the laws, inside and out; that the votes were sorted, counted, declared and sealed up, in open town meeting, the committee declined to admit any testimony on this part of the remonstrance, and accepted and counted the votes of Fairfield.

The constitution of the State having provided that the votes for Governor shall be received, sorted, counted, declared, recorded and sealed up in open town meeting, and returned into the Secretary's office, and laid by him before the Senate and House of Representatives, and the form of return having been established by law—the committee believed, that it might not be competent to them or the Legislature to go into any testimony to invalidate or contradict the returns or disfranchise the electors of towns whose returns were made according to the constitution and the laws, excepting in cases where fraud was suggested or illegal. Your committee were disposed distinctly to recognize this rule in relation to the returns from the towns of Leeds, Fairfield and Fayette—the evils resulting from a different course would in the opinion of your committee tend to protracting indefinitely the organization of the Government,







County of Oxford to Job Prince Dr.  
For services as County Commissioner.  
1837. To one day to appoint agents to take the census in the unincorporated Townships in said County, pursuant to an Act of March 24, 1837, 3.00  
To travel from Turner to Paris & home, 24 miles, 3.40  
May 2. To travel from Turner to Brownfield on Pet. of Daniel Bean and als. 55 miles, 5.60  
To one day viewing on said Pet. 5.00  
" 3. To travel from Brownfield to Hiram and back to Brownfield on Pet. of Joseph Brown and als. being a joint view with Cumberland Commissioners 10 miles, 1.50  
To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and adjudicating on said Pet. 9.00  
" 4. To one day hearing the parties and adjudicating on Pet. of Daniel Bean and als. 3.00  
" 5. To travel from Brownfield to Moore Hutchins in Lovel on Pet. of Wm. Lebaron and als. 16 miles, 1.60  
To three days viewing hearing the parties and adjudicating on said Pet. 9.00  
" 13. To travel from said Hutchins to Bassett's Tavern in Lovel on Pet. of James Walker and als. 2 miles, 1.20  
To 3 days on said Pet. 1.50  
To travel home to Turner 40 miles, 4.00  
To 3 days assessing Tax on Township No. 6, 1.50  
June 12. To travel from Brownfield to Zury Robinson's in Sumner on Pet. of John Moulton and als. 14 ms. To three days viewing hearing the parties and adjudicating on said Pet. 9.00  
To travel from said W. Corlie's in Sumner home, 1.10  
To 4 days unking plans and reports, 12.00  
\$69.70

JOB PRINCE.  
Oxford, ss: June 22, 1837. Personally appeared Job Prince and made oath that the foregoing account by him subscribed, is true as to time and charges, and as to distance according to his best knowledge and belief.  
Before me, J. G. COLE, Clerk.

County of Oxford to Abel Gibson Dr.  
For services as County Commissioner.  
1837. To travel from Brownfield to Paris Court House and home, 72 miles, 7.20  
" 23. To one day appointing agents to take the census in unincorporated places in said County, 2.00  
May 2. To travel from my house to Zack. Miller's in Brownfield and home, twice on Pet. of Daniel Bean & others, 1.00  
To 2 days attendance on said Pet. 6.00  
" 3. To travel from Brownfield to John Kimball's in Hiram and home on Pet. of Joseph Brown and others, on a joint view with Cumberland County Commissioners, 20 miles, 2.00  
To 3 days attendance on said petition, 9.00  
" 10. To travel from Brownfield to Moses Hutchins in Lovel on Pet. of Wm. Lebaron and others, 14 miles, 1.40  
To three days attendance on said Pet. 9.00  
" 13. To travel from Moses Hutchins Jr. to Joseph Bassett's in Lovel and home on Pet. of James Walker and others, 15 miles, and 3 days attendance, 3.00  
June 12. To travel from Brownfield to Zury Robinson's in Sumner and home on Pet. of John Moulton & others, 98 miles, 9.80  
" 13 & 14. To 1-2-3 days attendance on said Pet. 5.00  
\$66.40

ABEL GIBSON.  
Oxford, ss: June 22, 1837. Personally appeared Abel Gibson and made oath that the foregoing account by him subscribed, is true as to time and charges, and as to distance, according to his best knowledge and belief.  
Before me, J. G. COLE, Clerk.

County of Oxford to John Hearsey Dr.  
For services as County Commissioner.  
1837. To one day at Paris to appoint agents to take the census in unincorporated places in said County, 3.00  
" 2. To travel to and from Paris 40 miles, 4.00  
May 2. To travel to Carbridge and home to carry papers to Freeman Ellis Agent, 24 miles, 2.00  
To travel from home to Brownfield on Pet. of Daniel Bean and als. 55, 5.50  
To one day viewing on said Pet. 5.00  
" 3. To travel from Brownfield to Hiram on Pet. of Joseph Brown & als. 73 miles, .75  
To 3 days viewing and hearing the parties jointly with the Commissioners of Cumberland Co. 9.00  
To travel from Hiram to Brownfield, 73 miles, .75  
" 6. To hearing the parties on Pet. of Daniel Bean and als. and adjudicating on same one day, 4.30  
" 10. To travel from Brownfield to Moses Hutchins Jr. in Lovel on Pet. of Wm. Lebaron and als. 16 miles, 1.60  
To three days viewing, hearing the parties, &c. on said Pet. 9.00  
To travel from said Hutchins to Bassett's in Lovel, 2 miles, on Pet. of James Walker, .20  
" 13. To 3 days on said Pet. 1.50  
To travel home on said Pet. 45 miles, 4.50  
" 14. To 3 days assessing Tax on Township No. 6, 1.50  
June 12. To travel from home to Zury Robinson's in Sumner, on Pet. of John Moulton & als. 10 ms. To three days viewing, hearing the parties and adjudicating on said Pet. 9.00  
To travel from David W. Corlie's home on said Pet. 12 miles, 1.20  
\$69.60

JOHN HEARSEY.  
Oxford, ss: June 22, 1837. Personally appeared John Hearsey and made oath that the foregoing account by him subscribed is true as to time, charges, and as to distance, according to his best knowledge and belief.  
Before me, J. G. COLE, Clerk.

County of Oxford to Job Prince Dr.  
For services as County Commissioner.  
1837. To travel from Turner to Denmark and home on Pet. of Committee of town of Denmark, 90 ms. To two days viewing, hearing the parties &c. 6.00  
Sept. 12. To travel from Turner to Rumford on Pet. of Lyman Rawson and als. 30 miles, 3.00  
To two days viewing, hearing the parties, 6.00  
" 15. To travel from Andover to Bethel on Pet. of James Walker and als. 18 ms. 1.8  
To four days hearing parties and locating, 12.00  
To 3 days viewing, hearing parties and locating on Pet. of Frederick Coburn and als., 16.50  
" 25. To travel from Greenwood to Paris and back to Greenwood to adjourn, on Pet. of Committee of town of Paris and a day, 8.10  
" 26. To travel from Noble's Corner in Norway to Eleazer Dunham Jr.'s, in Paris on Pet. of Committee of the town of Paris 10 miles, 1.00  
To viewing and hearing the parties 31 days, 10.50  
To travel from said Dunham's home 22 miles, 2.20  
Oct. 3. To travel from Turner to Baldwin and back on Pet. of Ephraim Flint and als. being a joint view with Cumberland Commissioners, 122 miles, 12.80  
To 11 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on said Pet. 4.50  
" 10. To travel from Turner to Buckfield and home on Pet. of Isaac Chase and als. 16 miles, 1.60  
To one day viewing, hearing the parties, 2.00  
" 11. To travel from Turner to Jay on Pet. of N. Crafts and als., 2.00  
To one day viewing on said petition, 3.00  
" 12. To travel from Jay to Rumford on Pet. of Lyman Rawson and als. being an adjourned meeting, 22 miles, 2.20  
To 13 days viewing and adjudicating on said Pet. 4.50  
To travel home 30 miles, 3.00  
" 16. To travel from Turner to S. Paris on Pet. of a committee of the town of Paris, being an adjourned meeting, 2.00  
To two days viewing and adjudicating on said Pet. 6.00  
" 18. To travel from S. Paris to David Morrill's in Sumner, on Pet. of said Morrill and als. 13 miles, 1.30  
To three days viewing, hearing the parties and adjudicating on said Pet. 9.00  
" 24. To travel from Turner to Flagstaff mill in the County of Somerset on Pet. of Joshua Gaultin and als. being a joint view with Somerset Commissioners, 65 miles, 6.50  
To 23 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on said Pet. 10.50  
To travel home 85 miles, 8.50  
" one day making Reports and plans, 9.00  
\$160.50

The foregoing account is true as to time and distance charged according to my best knowledge and belief.  
JOHN PRINCE.  
Oxford, ss: Nov. 22, 1837. Sworn to before me, J. G. COLE, Clerk.

County of Oxford to Abel Gibson Dr.  
For services as County Commissioner.  
1837. To travel from Brownfield to Samuel Gibson's in Denmark and home on Pet. of Samuel Gibson & als. 16 miles, 1.60  
Sept. 6. To 2 days services on said Pet. 6.00  
Sept. 13. To travel from Brownfield to Jes. Hall's in Rumford on Pet. of Lyman Rawson and als. 57 miles, 5.70  
" 15. To 2 days attendance on said petition, and adjourned, 6.00  
" 20. To travel from Andover Corner to James Walker's in Bethel 18 miles, on Pet. of James Walker & others, 1.80  
" 20. To 6 days attendance on Pet. of Frederick Coburn and als., 18.00  
To travel from David Noyes' in Norway to Eleazer Dunham Jr. in Paris on Pet. of John Porter and als. and home 46 miles—adjourned, 4.60  
To travel from Brownfield to Paris Cape agreeable to adjournment 33 miles, 3.30  
" 22. To 7 days attendance on said Pet. 21.00  
Oct. 2. To travel from Brownfield to Pichard Flint in Baldwin and home, on Pet. of Ephraim Flint & others, being a joint view with Cumberland County Commissioners, 86 miles, 8.60  
" 2. to 11 days attendance on said Pet. 2.50  
" 2. travel from Brownfield to Brigham's tavern in Buckfield on Pet. of Isaac Chase and others, 43 miles, 4.30  
" 10. to 2 days attendance on said petition, 4.00  
" travel from Buckfield to Jay hill on Pet. of Nathan Crafts and als. 18 miles, and one day's attendance on said Pet. 4.80  
to travel from Jay hill to Jos. Hall's in Rumford on Pet. of Lyman Rawson and als. agreeable to adjournment, and from said Hills home 88 ms. 8.80  
" 14. to 14 days attendance on said Pet. 4.50  
to travel from Paris Cape to David Morrill's in Sumner, on Pet. of David Morrill and others 12 miles, 1.20  
" 18. to three days attendance on said Pet. 9.00  
to travel from Brownfield to Flagstaff mill on the Dead River in Somerset Co. on Pet. of Joshua Gaultin and als. being a joint view with Somerset Co. Commissioners, 86 miles, 8.60  
" 24. to 3 days attendance on said Pet. 12.80  
to travel from said Flagstaff home 128 miles, \$159.10

The foregoing account is true as to time and distance charged according to my best knowledge and belief.

ABEL GIBSON.  
Oxford, ss: Nov. 2, 1837. Sworn to before me, J. G. COLE, Clerk.

County of Oxford to John Hearsey Dr.  
For services as County Commissioner.  
1837. To travel to Denmark and home on Pet. of Committee of Denmark 180 miles, 18.00  
Sept. 13. to travel to Joseph Hall's in Rumford on Pet. of Lyman Rawson and als. 16 miles, 1.60  
" 15. to 2 days on same, 6.00  
" 16. to travel from Andover to James Walker's in Bethel on Pet. of James Walker and als., 1.80  
" 20. to 6 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on Pet. of Fred. Coburn and als., 18.00  
" 26. to travel from David Noyes' in Norway to E. Dunham's in Paris on Pet. of John Porter & als. Committee of Paris, 9 miles, 9.00  
" 5 days on said Pet. before adjournment, 15.00  
Oct. 3. to travel from said Paris to Baldwin on Pet. of Ephraim Flint and als. 48 miles, 4.80  
" 18. to 14 days viewing, hearing parties and locating on same, 4.50  
to travel from Hiram home on same, 66 miles, 6.60  
" 10. to travel to Buckfield on Pet. of Isaac Chase and als. 16 miles, 1.60  
" 11. to one day on same viewing and hearing parties, to travel to Jay on same, 18 miles, 1.80  
" 12. to travel from Jay home, 6 miles, .60  
" 12. to travel from home to Joseph Hall's in Rumford and back, on Pet. of Lyman Rawson, by adjournment, 24 miles, 2.40  
" 14. to 14 day on same, 4.50  
" 16. to travel from home to S. Paris on Pet. of John Porter and als. 22 miles, 2.20  
" 22. to 2 days on same on adjournment, 6.00  
" 18. to travel from Paris to David Morrill's in Sumner, on Pet. of David Morrill & als. 13 miles, 1.30  
to travel from Jona. Bucks home on same, 16 ms., 1.60  
to three days viewing and locating the parties, 9.00  
" 24. to travel from home to Flagstaff on Dead River and home again on Pet. of Joshua Gaultin and als. 140 miles, 14.00  
to 34 days on same, \$148.40

The foregoing account is true as to time and distance charged, according to my best knowledge and belief.

JOHN HEARSEY.  
Oxford, ss: Nov. 3, 1837. Sworn to before me, J. G. COLE, Clerk.

County of Oxford to Job Prince Dr.  
For services as County Commissioner.  
1837. To travel 40 miles \$4, attendance 3 days \$9 13.00  
Abel Gibson, " 80 " \$9 " 3 " 9 18.00  
John Hearsey " 40 " \$4 " 3 " 9 13.00  
October Term, A. D. 1837.  
Abel Gibson, " 80 " \$9 " 3 " 9 13.00  
John Hearsey, " 40 " \$4 " 3 " 9 13.00

The foregoing accounts were severally examined, audited and amount certified by the County Attorney and Clerk agreeably to the Statute, and are truly copied by

J. G. COLE, Clerk.

CLERK'S OFFICE.  
Co. of Oxford, Dec. 26, 1847.

COLLECTOR'S NOTICE.—WALD.

NOTICE is hereby given to the non-resident owners of land and proprietors of land in the town of Wald, County of Oxford, and State of Maine, that the same are taxed in the bills committed to the undersigned, Collector of the town of Wald, for the year 1836, the respective sums, viz:

Names unknown.	No. of Lots.	No. of Acres.	Value.
	18 1	183	33 56
	18 2	180	33 8
	18 3	190	33 5
	18 4	191	16 2
	18 5	192	22 3
	18 6	193	38 6
	15 3	160	44 7
	15 5	160	44 7
	15 6	160	88 1,5
	15 9	160	44 7
	14 6	160	44 7
	16 9	160	44 1,3
	17 6	160	33 5
	17 7	160	44 7
	18 10	197	16 2
	18 11	194	11 1
	18 12	223	11 1
	16 10	160	55 9
	16 11	160	44 7
	16 12	160	11 1
	17 3	160	77 1,3
	1 12	132	50 8
	2 3	144	52 9
	14 3	80	44 7
	18 9	196	44 7
	16 8	160	54 7
	9 1	100	44 7
	17 8	150	11 1
	17 9	160	16 2
	15 4	160	28 3
	16 7	196	6 10
	17 10	160	11 1
	17 5	160	9 15

Charles Pratt, Unknown,	1 12	132	50 8
	2 3	144	52 9
	14 3	80	44 7
	18 9	196	44 7
	16 8	160	54 7
	9 1	100	44 7
	17 8	150	11 1
	17 9	160	16 2
	15 4	160	28 3
	16 7	196	6 10
	17 10	160	11 1
	17 5	160	9 15